

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01743 01 OF 02 262126Z
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00
NSC-05 /064 W
-----262130Z 129330 /66

P R 262046Z MAR 77
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2463
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
INFO CINCLANT
USCINCEUR
USLOSACLANT
USNRM SHAPE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 1743

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: MPOL, NATO
SUBJECT: MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977: COMMENTS ON THIRD DRAFT

REF: (A) USNATO 1609 (DTG 221330Z MAR 77), (B) USNATO 1573
(DTG 210817Z MAR 77), (C) USNATO 1537 (DTG 171920Z MAR 77)

SUMMARY: THE THIRD DRAFT OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977
(REF A) REFLECTS ACCURATELY THE AD REFERENDUM DPC DELIB-
ERATIONS OF MARCH 16 AND 18 (REFS B, C), AND GOES A LONG
WAY TOWARD MEETING OUR OBJECTIVE OF A CONCISE, SELF-
CONTAINED DOCUMENT WHICH EMPHASIZES THE NEED FOR ALLIES
TO ALLOCATE INCREASED RESOURCES TO CRITICALLY DEFICIENT
DEFENSE AREAS AND TO REDOUBLE THEIR EFFORTS TO USE RE-
SOURCES MORE EFFECTIVELY THROUGH INCREASED AND BETTER-
ORGANIZED COOPERATIVE EFFORTS. WE BELIEVE MINISTERIAL
GUIDANCE 1977 SHOULD IDENTIFY THE NEED FOR BETTER USE OF
RESOURCES AND AN IMPROVED ALLIANCE PLANNING MECHANISM, AS
WELL AS PROVIDE A PLATFORM FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMMATIC IMPROVE-
MENTS. OUR COMMENTS ON THE THIRD DRAFT, AND PROPOSALS FOR
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01743 01 OF 02 262126Z

AMENDMENT AT DRC WEEK OF APRIL 4 FOLLOW IN SUBSEQUENT
PARAGRAPHS. ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON GUIDANCE BY
COB, MARCH 31. END SUMMARY.

1. SECTIONS I, II, III. EXCEPT FOR SOME MINOR EDITING,
E.G., ADDING "NATO DEFENSE PLANNING" TO PARA 2 AND SUBSTI-
TUTING "GENERAL" FOR "ALL -OUT" NUCLEAR WAR IN PARA 4, WE
BELIEVE THESE SECTIONS ARE ABOUT RIGHT.

2. SECTION IV. THE MARITIME PARAGRAPH (14) COULD BE

STRENGTHENED BY ADDING A MORE EXPLICIT REFERENCE TO THE "THREAT TO NATO INTERESTS AT LEVELS OF CONFLICT BELOW THAT OF GENERAL WAR." WE WOULD ALSO ADD LANGUAGE TO PARAGRAPH 18 (ON "DEFICIENCIES IN THE ALLIED RESPONSE") THAT ROUNDS OUT THIS SECTION OF THE DOCUMENT BY NOTING THAT PRESENT NATO PLANS FALL FAR SHORT OF CORRECTING THE DEFICIENCIES IDENTIFIED.

3. SECTION V. IN PARA 25 WE WOULD CHANGE "MOST MODERN" TO "EFFECTIVE" WEAPONS. WE WOULD PREFER DELETION FROM PARA 29 OF EXPLICIT MENTION OF MARITIME MISSION OF "PROTECTING" THE SEA LANES, OR PROPOSE "DEFENDING" AS A SUBSTITUTE, WHICH WOULD ALLOW FOR THE POSSIBILITY OF OFFENSIVE NAVAL TACTICS IN DEFENSE OF THE SEA LANES. WE CONTINUE TO FAVOR DELETION OF PARA 30, OR AT LEAST CLARIFICATION OF ITS INTENDED MEANING. REGARDING LOGISTICS (PARA 32), WE BELIEVE THAT: (A) SUBTITLE SHOULD INCLUDE "WAR RESERVE STOCKS"; (B) LANGUAGE SHOULD BE INCLUDED STRESSING NEED FOR FUNDS FOR COMMON INFRASTRUCTURE IN SUPPORT OF LOGISTICS; (C) A MUCH MORE POSITIVE STATEMENT IS NEED OF NATO'S CONCURRENT RESPONSIBILITY FOR HARMONIZING AND COORDINATING NATIONAL LOGISTICS EFFORTS IN PEACETIME AND MANAGING MULTINATIONAL LOGISTICS IN WARTIME; AND (D) THIS PARAGRAPH SHOULD BE MOVED TO THE SECTION ON "ALLIANCE COOPERATION."

4. SECTION VI. WITH MINOR EDITING, WE FAVOR RETENTION OF CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01743 01 OF 02 262126Z

THIS SECTION AS WRITTEN. A STATEMENT OF THE NEED FOR BETTER USE OF RESOURCES SHOULD BE APPENDED TO THE LAST PARAGRAPH, AS A TRANSITION TO THE SECTION ON ALLIANCE COOPERATION. WE PROPOSE TO REPLACE THE "SERIES OF DOTS" DESCRIBING EXTENT OF REAL ANNUAL INCREASES WITH THE FIGURE "3", AND TO TAKE BRACKETS IN THE NEXT DRAFT IF NECESSARY. WE WOULD ACQUIESCE TO EXPECTED WISH OF OTHERS TO SEE THAT FIGURE REFERRED TO AS AN "ANNUAL AVERAGE," RATHER THAN AS APPLYING NECESSARILY TO EACH YEAR OF THE PLANNING PERIOD. WE EXPECT OTHERS TO FAVOR REFERENCE TO "NATO EUROPE AVERAGE," RATHER THAN "NATO AVERAGE," IN DISCUSSING THOSE NATIONS FROM WHOM A SPECIAL EFFORT IS REQUIRED, AND PROPOSE TO INSIST THAT "EUROPE" BE BRACKETED.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 01743 02 OF 02 262135Z
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00
NSC-05 /064 W
-----262139Z 129366 /66

P R 262046Z MAR 77
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2464
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
INFO CINCLANT
USCINCEUR
USLOSACLANT
USNRM SHAPE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 1743

5. SECTION VII. THE SCOPE OF THIS SECTION NEEDS TO BE FURTHER EXPANDED TO INCLUDE MORE DISCUSSION OF RATIONALIZATION, PARTICULARLY IN THE FIELD OF COMMUNICATIONS, EW AND EXERCISES. WE WOULD ADD INTRODUCTORY LANGUAGE THAT WOULD IDENTIFY THE NEED FOR ORDERLY PLANNING AND INTEGRATION OF COOPERATING PROGRAMS WITH OTHER ELEMENTS OF NATIONAL EFFORTS. THE SCOPE OF LAST PARAGRAPH (45) MUST BE EXPANDED TO PROVIDE AN IMPETUS TO THOSE ACTIVITIES NEEDED TO ENSURE COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING IN SUPPORT OF ALLIANCE FORCES (NOT SIMPLY LONG-TERM ARMAMENTS PLANNING), AND TO EXPLICITLY STATE THE NEED FOR DOVETAILING OF SUPPORT PLANNING EFFORTS WITH THOSE INVOLVING FORCE PLANNING.

6. SECTION VIII.

A. PRIORITIES. WE WILL ATTEMPT TO RETAIN THE DEGREE OF SPECIFICITY IN THE PRESENT DRAFT AND TO RESIST EXPANSION OF PARAGRAPH 47. TO ASSUAGE ALLIES WHO SHRINK FROM THE USE OF THE TERM "PRIORITIES," WE MAY HAVE TO BE PREPARED TO AMEND THE TITLE OF THIS SECTION SUBSTITUTING A TERM SUCH
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01743 02 OF 02 262135Z

AS "GUIDELINES" FOR "PRIORITIES." TO NOTE THAT THE "PRIORITIES" IN PARAGRAPH 47 REFER TO ALLIANCE-WIDE NEEDS AND ARE NOT APPLICABLE ACROSS THE BOARD WITHOUT REFERENCE TO SPECIFIC DEFICIENCIES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS AT THE REGIONAL AND NATIONAL LEVEL, WE PROPOSE TO ADD A PARAGRAPH TO THIS EFFECT.

B. TRADE-OFFS. WE BELIEVE THAT OBTAINING LANGUAGE IN MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE TO THE EFFECT THAT NATIONS AND MILITARY AUTHORITIES MUST CONSIDER TRADE-OFFS WITHIN NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAMS TO MEET HIGHER PRIORITY NATO DEFENSE NEEDS SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE A PRIORITY EFFORT. WE RECOGNIZE, HOWEVER, THAT THE MILITARY AUTHORITIES ARE RELUCTANT TO RECOMMEND TRADE-OFFS, CITING THAT (A) THEY LACK SUFFICIENT ANALYTICAL STAFF TO DO THE IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL PROGRAMS REQUIRED, (B) NATIONS DO NOT PROVIDE COMPLETE INFORMATION ABOUT THEIR PLANS, AND (C) THEY DO NOT WANT TO ENGAGE IN THE "POLITICAL" EXERCISE OF SUGGESTING THAT NATIONS REALIGN THEIR DEFENSE PROGRAMS. NONETHELESS, WE BELIEVE THAT

THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE ALLIANCE TO PROPOSE TRADE-OFFS TO NATIONAL AUTHORITIES IS ESSENTIAL IF NATO IS TO MAKE BETTER USE OF AVAILABLE RESOURCES AND PROGRESS TOWARD A BALANCED COLLECTIVE DEFENSE POSTURE. RECOGNIZING THAT WE MAY BE ISLOATED IN THIS EFFORT DURING THE NEXT DRC DRAFTING SESSION, WE PROPOSE TO STAND FAST ON THE CONCEPT OF TRADE-OFFS AND TAKE BRACKETS IF NECESSARY, BUT WE WILL ATTEMPT TO DEVISE LANGUAGE FOR POSSIBLE FUTURE USE THAT GETS THIS CONCEPT ACROSS WITHOUT USING THE "RED FLAG" TERM "TRADE-OFFS."

7. SECTION IX, GUIDANCE.

A. TRADE-OFFS. WE WOULD HOPE THAT THE DRC COULD FIND LANGUAGE THAT DIRECTS CONSIDERATION OF TRADE-OFFS WITHIN NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAMS.

B. FORCE PROPOSAL PRESENTATION AND REVIEW. TO ADD
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01743 02 OF 02 262135Z

COHERENCE AND STRUCTURE TO THE FORCE PROPOSALS REVIEW PROCESS, WE PROPOSE TO ADD A PARAGRAPH DIRECTING THE NMAS TO (A) GROUP THEIR PROPOSALS BY FUNCTIONAL AREAS CORRESPONDING TO THE CRITERIA SET FORTH IN PARAGRAPH 47, (B) INDICATE EXPLICITLY THE EXTENT TO WHICH IMPLEMENTATION OF THEIR FORCE PROPOSALS WOULD CORRECT THE DEFICIENCIES OUTLINED IN SECTION V, AND (C) GROUP FORCE PROPOSALS IN ORDER OF PRIORITY, WITH NO MORE THAN 1/4 OF NEW PROPOSALS ACCORDED THE HIGHEST PRIORITY.

C. GUIDANCE TO THE DPC. FINALLY, WE WILL CONTINUE TO PRESS FOR INCLUSION OF A SUBSECTION ON GUIDANCE TO THE DPC IN PERMANENT SESSION.

8. ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON GUIDANCE BY COB MARCH 31.
STRAUSZ-HUPE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 30-Aug-1999 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 26-Mar-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 22 May 2009
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977NATO01743
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Expiration:
Film Number: n/a
Format: TEL
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t197703110/baaabcot.tel
Line Count: 203
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Message ID: 399f01b0-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) USNATO 1609 (DTG 221330Z MAR 77), (B) USNATO 1573 (DTG 210817Z MAR 77), (C) USNATO 1537 (DTG 171920Z MAR 77)
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 01-Oct-2004 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2963635
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977: COMMENTS ON THIRD DRAFT
TAGS: MPOL, NATO
To: STATE SECDEF MULTIPLE
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/399f01b0-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009